

# VIRGINIAN-PILOT.

—BY THE—  
VIRGINIAN AND PILOT PUBLISHING  
COMPANY.

KORFOLK VIRGINIAN AND DAILY PILOT.  
(Consolidated March, 1898.)

Entered at the Postoffice at Norfolk,  
Va., as second-class matter.

OFFICE: PILOT BUILDING,  
CITY HALL AVENUE,  
NORFOLK, VA.

OFFICERS:  
A. H. Grandy, President; W. S. Wilk-  
inson, Treasurer; James E. Allen, Sec-  
retary.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:  
A. H. Grandy, L. D. Starke, Jr., F. W.  
Barton, R. W. Shuttles, W. S. Wilkinson,  
James E. Allen, D. F. Donovan.

THREE CENTS PER COPY.

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

The VIRGINIAN-PILOT is delivered to  
subscribers by carriers in Norfolk and  
vicinity, Portsmouth, Berkley, Suffolk,  
West Norfolk, Newport News, for 10  
cents per week, payable to the carrier.  
By mail, to any place in the United  
States, postage free:

DAILY, one year	\$5.00
" six months	3.00
" three months	1.50
" one month	.50

## ADVERTISING RATES:

Advertisements inserted at the rate of 25 cents a  
square, first insertion; each subsequent  
insertion 40 cents, or 50 cents, when in-  
serted Every Other Day. Contractors are  
not allowed to exceed their space or ad-  
vertise other than their legitimate busi-  
ness, except by paying especially for the  
same.

Reading Notices invariably 20 cents per  
line first insertion. Each subsequent in-  
sertion 15 cents.

No employee of the Virginian-Pilot Pub-  
lishing Company is authorized to contract  
any obligation in the name of the com-  
pany, or to make any purchase in the name  
of the same, except upon orders signed by  
the PRESIDENT OF THE COMPANY.

In order to avoid delays, an account of  
personal absence, letters and all commu-  
nications for THE VIRGINIAN-PILOT  
should not be addressed to any individual  
connected with the office, but simply to  
THE VIRGINIAN AND PILOT PUBLISH-  
ING COMPANY.

## TWELVE PAGES

SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1899.

### THE PEOPLE VS. CONVENTIONS.

There is undoubtedly a great deal  
said just now about the Roanoke Demo-  
cratic State Convention, and what it  
did, especially with respect to the U.  
S. Senatorship, then to be filled from  
this State. After full discussion, here  
is what it did:

"We cordially and heartily endorse  
the course of our beloved and distin-  
guished Senator, John W. Daniel, in  
the United States Senate, AND WILL  
OPPOSE ANY CANDIDATE for the  
Legislature and Senate of Virginia  
who is not in favor of his nomination."

It endorsed Senator John W. Daniel,  
and expressed its wish and favor for  
his renomination; yet it all the more  
emphatically confessed its entire lack  
of authority to nominate or renominate  
him BY WHAT IT DID. That it was  
equivalent to a nomination is not  
true; for if the people and the Legisla-  
ture they nominated and elected had  
not been in favor of him, the resolution  
of the convention would have been  
but brutum fulmen, and would have  
been laughed at by people and Legisla-  
ture. Nor in any case could it be  
equivalent to a nomination or renomi-  
nation, in law, right, or fact, for it  
confesses (as already said) that it  
cannot nominate, will not attempt to  
do so, and only threatens those who  
may have this power with the displeas-  
ure and opposition of the convention  
if they do not favor Mr. Daniel. The  
real truth is that the resolution of the  
convention but voiced the endorsement  
of Major Daniel DEMANDED FROM  
IT BY THE PEOPLE.

The only point of any value as a  
decision, precedent, or opinion, is that  
the Roanoke Convention disclaimed all  
power of nominating Senators, and ex-  
pressed its favor for his renomination,  
coupled with A THREAT OF POPU-  
LAR WRATH AGAINST ALL HIS  
OPPONENTS.

But there is here, so far, no question  
of candidates. From the first meeting  
of the conference, the subject of candi-  
dates was loudly declared to be far  
beyond the jurisdiction of the proposed  
meeting and consultation. Not only  
was this so, but the convention itself  
overwhelmingly voted down a proposi-  
tion to consider anything with re-  
spect to candidates. Yet the manag-  
ers, under their blanket resolutions,  
and by personal and official urgency,  
get through a proposition, distasteful  
to nearly all of the conference, to ask  
the Democratic State Committee to call  
a convention to nominate a candidate.  
The convention, indeed, voted out, with  
much enthusiasm, the whole matter of  
a Democratic State Convention; but to  
please their committee on business and  
resolutions, the question was reconsidered  
and the monstrous thing was ad-  
mitted—monstrous, we mean, in its  
usurpation and inconsistency, though it  
will probably amount to nothing except  
as an illustration how easily a body of  
wise men may be led into folly.

We do sincerely hope the State Demo-  
cratic Committee will not allow it-  
self to be involved in this folly and  
thereby involve the State Democratic  
party in what may thereby become  
something worse than a blunder. The  
friends of Senatorial reform desire this  
Virginia movement to unite all the  
States and their people in it; but it  
will be easy for fool friends to make  
it abortive even as a State reform by  
overloading it with personal and fac-  
tional motives and intrigues in the  
very outset. THE VIRGINIAN-PI-  
LOT is for the people, but for no in-  
dividual, in this matter. The people,  
he nobody!

### KEEP STEP, OR FALL OUT!

Take the entire backbone out of the  
Democratic party, and then the Times  
will consent to be one of its steering  
committee. Of course, we refer to the  
Richmond Times, for no other paper  
that we know of has set so high a value  
on itself as to demand that 6,500,000  
Democrats shall surrender to it in  
every real, live issue before it will  
serve them as boss and absolute dicta-  
tor. Thanks, dear Times; we got  
along without you in 1896 and ever  
since, and would never miss you and all  
your crowd if you would all go quietly  
to Jericho.

The Charlottesville Progress is wast-  
ing time on one who knows it all, and  
whose attachment to any party is  
avowedly dependent upon its surrender  
to him. What we want are real Demo-  
crats, who believe in majority rule, not  
in minority, nor individual, rule, no  
matter what opinions the minority or  
himself, or other minor matters. The  
party and its principles, as represented  
by the majority, is the infallible  
source, the omnipotent power, and the  
only thing worth talking of in Demo-  
cracy, or considering. If anyone will not  
agree to that he is not only no Demo-  
crat, but who desires to get all he can  
out of Democracy without giving  
anything in return.

What difference does it make with a  
true American, who well knows that  
we are governed by parties, and can  
be governed no otherwise and be free,  
that we differ about anything, if, on  
the whole, or on the chief points in dis-  
pute, his party and associates are in  
agreement with him? Especially are  
temporary and sordid issues to be elim-  
inated as non essential to party faith  
and fealty. Whether our money be  
gold or silver is of small consequence  
so we have a plenty of it, and even  
if "business" depend wholly on one of  
the other, what is that when compared  
with the assertion and maintenance of  
liberty, manhood, self-respect and  
honor? What does it amount to practi-  
cally, if a man be for gold only, and  
another for both gold and silver, if  
both are true to the principles and the  
party of Democracy? What cares that  
either or both are for this policy or  
that in finance, or expansion (so it does  
not involve imperialism), or any side  
of any side issue, so he stands by the  
party for the sake of its fidelity to  
human freedom, the rights of man, and  
the equal administration of the laws?  
The true line in politics is any differ-  
ence, no matter how trivial in itself,  
that involves human liberty, equality  
and right, or power, in civil things;  
and everything else, no matter how  
great it may be in other respects, is  
as nothing in political and party con-  
sideration, and may be differed about  
as freely and fully in the party as the  
weather. But it is the individual that  
must subordinate himself to the party;  
the minority it is that must submit  
to the majority; for it is indispensa-  
ble that all differences, essential or  
non-essential, must be settled, and it is  
preposterous that the individual or a  
minority should rule. There is mean-  
while no coercion. You freely march to  
battle under the flag, or you desert to  
the enemy,—and nobody can arrest or  
stay you.

### A VERY GRAVE MATTER.

To disarm any people, or class of  
people, is a very serious thing, except  
in one case only, and that is when a  
government disbands its own victorious  
troops, and requires the "turning in"  
of the arms it has assuaged. Even in this  
latter case, it is often considered the  
better policy to let the men retain their  
arms as mementoes of the war, every  
true soldier having developed some af-  
fection for the weapon which has so  
long shared his dangers and carried  
him to victory.

The proposed disarming of the Cuban  
soldiers—every man receiving an in-  
stalment of his back-pay only on con-  
dition that he turn over his arms to  
the U. S. authorities—is particularly  
and peculiarly distasteful and offensive  
to the Cubans. The arms are not all  
the property of the United States, and  
probably few, if any, were received di-  
rectly from the United States by their  
possessors, who hold them as the arms  
of the Cuban Republic, or as their per-  
sonal property. The occasion, too, is  
unfortunate, as it seems to be seized  
upon by Gen. Brooke as an opportunity  
to exercise coercion to secure the Cuban  
disarming. To make the surrender  
of the arms an indispensable condition  
of paying any arrears looks suspi-  
cious to the Cubans, who naturally feel  
humiliated in yielding their arms to  
foreigners. In fact, the whole business  
seems designed, in the Cuban mind,  
to affront them and to make them confess  
their subjection to the Americans by a  
public passing under the yoke of the  
United States; and, from any point of  
view, the plan shows no good policy,  
or judgment, no good feeling, or trust,  
or consideration, that should be mani-  
fested on our side.

Admit that this large body of men,  
just turned out of the public service  
and turned loose upon the public, with-  
out employment, or any visible or other  
means of support, should be disarmed;  
—surely some tact and discretion  
should have been employed. Some  
other way, some other occasion, some  
other recipient of the arms, should  
have been provided; and though the  
Cubans must submit to the decision of  
our government in the matter, or at-  
tempt a hopeless revolt, it was and  
is all the more the duty of the U. S.,  
under the circumstances, to have  
sought the least provoking and irri-  
tating mode of dealing with the sub-  
ject.

Naturally every man dislikes to be  
disarmed, and just as naturally he sus-

pects the designs of the disarmers, es-  
pecially when they are of another race  
and language. Nor can it be truly said  
that the United States government has  
pursued a conciliatory manner in deal-  
ing with the Cubans. We have exhib-  
ited a lack of openness and frankness  
as to our purposes and designs well  
calculated to incite distrust; and on  
the other hand, we have shown no di-  
plomacy in this reticence that might  
have rendered it a valuable cover or  
reserve under any contingencies. We  
are suspected of the worst, and if we  
do the best, we shall receive no thanks;  
and all through our own fault.

The attempt of a few newspapers in  
Virginia and elsewhere to belittle the  
May Conference at Richmond, in be-  
half of U. S. Senatorial reform, has al-  
ready fallen flat. The need of such re-  
form is so generally felt, and the peo-  
ple themselves have taken so much in-  
terest in it, that it will go on not only  
in Virginia, but in most of the States,  
even if the amendment of the U. S.  
Constitution fail: that not being ab-  
solutely essential to success. The in-  
terest already awakened among the  
people concerning the choice of Sena-  
tors is in itself a long step toward re-  
form, and it may be so directed as to  
make and enforce the real reform with-  
out any help from laws or constitutions.  
Public opinion, resolutely, actively and  
wisely operated on by legislators by their  
constituents, may and should work a  
revolution in the Senate,—making a  
certain class of men practically in eli-  
gible to that body, and the people prac-  
tically dictating in every case whom  
their legislators shall elect.

The May Conference has given the  
movement a send-off and momentum  
that will assure it the favor and influ-  
ence of the people and of all good men  
of all classes—which will make it ir-  
resistible, unless its friends betray it  
by making its selections of candidates  
too much a matter of intrigue, combi-  
nation and chicane, instead of merit  
and popular choice.

"Gents" for gentlemen, "pants" for  
pantaloon, &c., have long been held  
hardly "genteel" enough for use among  
people who are themselves of questiona-  
ble gentility—"genteel" itself being still  
seated below the salt in the best circles,  
where the polite, well bred and re-  
fined sit at the head of the table. But  
while there has been no sufficient ex-  
cuse yet been found for calling gentle-  
men "gents" why not call pantaloon  
"pants"? To expend so much breath  
and ceremony on our nether integu-  
ments is a sheer waste of both on a low  
subject, and if to call them "pants"  
will banish "breeches," by all means  
say "pants!" It is a neat abbreviation,  
very convenient; and it involves no  
lack of courtesy or propriety. "Pants"  
may properly be worn by gentlemen,  
as well as by "gents."

We call attention to the fact that the  
United States government has paid to  
the Spanish government the immense  
sum of \$20,000,000 without the necessity  
of shipping abroad one ounce of gold.  
There was no handling of money in this  
transaction. The whole affair was ar-  
ranged by bills of exchange. This is  
one of the best illustrations that we  
have ever seen of the contention of  
the Times that in this day there is less  
and less need of actual money in the  
great transactions of life.—Richmond  
Times.

Pshaw! The \$20,000,000, however, as  
this was an honest deal, had to be  
actually in hand, in gold; or Spain's  
representatives would never have given  
a receipt for the money. And so it al-  
ways is: the money is essential some-  
where,—whether here or there may be  
of no consequence.

When a leading N. Y. newspaper un-  
dertakes to combat superstition with an  
imitation opal, it must be a scarce sea-  
son for logic up that way. Obviously,  
if ill-luck attend the wearing of a real  
opal, it will not do to plead that the  
alleged opal is glass artificially treat-  
ed with some opalescent preparation;  
for it is at least an honest error to  
wear the real opal, while to wear a  
counterfeit opal is to add the crime of  
fraud to the main offence, or error.

So the joke was not on the supersti-  
tion in the cited case of a false opal,  
but on the ill logic of the Journal mak-  
ing the citation. There are various  
similar jokes "on the wrong foot."

It is a curious fact that  
when there is a new boom  
in annexing Cuba, or a fresh re-  
vival of the spirit of philanthropy that  
would elevate the Philippines by shell  
and ball, the people of those islands are  
represented as utterly and incorrigibly  
worthless.

Next, at this rate, we will be eager to  
annex the leper islands and their peo-  
ple. We are so good and benevolent—  
don't you know?

This newly discovered longevity, to  
be derived from the lymph of young  
goats, is itself entirely too young—be-  
ing found out only a year ago as  
claimed. A Methuselah or two must  
be produced as the result of the  
lymph process before we shall  
commence to fear that this longevity  
boom is only a scheme to bull goats  
in the market. A year's experience, how-  
ever favorable, will hardly reduce life  
insurance rates.

The flowers on some of the new spring  
bonnets look so sweet and fresh that  
one can almost see the dew on them.—  
Norfolk Landmark.

We do hope that the ladies are not  
in the habit of leaving the price-tickets  
on their bonnets for inquisitive persons  
to scrutinize.

Capt. Coghlan and his ship (the Rai-  
leigh) sailed the Spanish and Asiatic  
seas in triumph, but the waters of im-  
perial America were too strong for  
them.

# VIRGINIAN-PILOT'S HOME STUDY CIRCLE

(Copyrighted, 1899.)

DIRECTED BY PROF. SEYMOUR EATON.

## SUBJECTS OF STUDY IN THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY WILL BE PUBLISHED.

- EVERY SUNDAY—  
History—Popular Studies in European History.
- EVERY TUESDAY—  
Geography—The World's Great Commercial Products.
- EVERY WEDNESDAY—  
Governments of the World of To-day.
- EVERY THURSDAY AND FRIDAY—  
Literature—Popular Studies in Literature.
- EVERY SATURDAY—  
Art—The World's Great Artists.

These courses will continue until June 26th. Examinations conducted  
by mail, will be held at their close as a basis for the granting of Certificates.

## THE WORLD'S GREAT ARTISTS.

### VI.—HOGARTH.

(Continued.)

BY JOHN EBENEZER BRYANT,  
M. A.

Hogarth rarely described himself as  
an artist. In the characteristic adver-  
tisements which he drew up, referring  
to his principal works, he spoke of him-  
self as their "author." This was not  
an affectation, although at first sight it  
might appear to be one. His purpose  
as an artist was always subordinate to  
his purpose as a moralist. He was a  
preacher of righteousness, but for his  
method instead of the spoken word he  
used pictorial representations embody-  
ing dramatic significances. Here is his  
own language in regard to the mat-  
ter:

"Ocular demonstrations will carry  
more conviction to the mind of a sen-  
sible man than all he could find in a  
thousand volumes, and this has been  
attempted in the prints I have com-

posed. Let the decision be left to any  
unprejudiced eye; let the figures in  
other pictures or prints be considered  
as players, dressed either for the sub-  
lime—for genteel comedy or farce—for  
high or low life. I have endeavored to  
treat my subjects as a dramatic writer;  
my picture is my stage, my men and  
women my players, who by means of  
certain actions and gestures are to ex-  
hibit a dumb show."

The "subjects" Hogarth had in mind  
in the above extract were those of a  
"moral kind and a moral nature."  
"These," he said, "will both entertain  
and inform the mind" and therefore be  
"of the greatest public utility." "They  
constitute," he further said, "a field  
not broken up in any country or age."



MISS FENTON AS POLLY PEACHAM.  
(From a portrait by Hogarth in the National gallery.)

posed. Let the decision be left to any  
unprejudiced eye; let the figures in  
other pictures or prints be considered  
as players, dressed either for the sub-  
lime—for genteel comedy or farce—for  
high or low life. I have endeavored to  
treat my subjects as a dramatic writer;  
my picture is my stage, my men and  
women my players, who by means of  
certain actions and gestures are to ex-  
hibit a dumb show."



HOGARTH'S TOMB, CHISWICK CHURCHYARD.

We have here Hogarth's own views  
as to the way in which his art should  
be judged, and this we may say is the  
way in which all modern critics have  
united to judge it. As he himself said,  
he "broke new ground." Never before  
in the history of art had the moral les-  
son been so definitely put forward as  
an object of attainment in art.  
And Hogarth attained his object by  
methods as original and individual as  
the object was itself novel. His pic-  
tures are, as he himself intended them  
to be, dramatic plays, full of life, full  
of meaning, full of actuality. Their  
elements of power are numerous. Every  
figure and pose is a study in itself, dis-  
tinct, individual, characteristic, char-  
acterized with its own significance. But what  
is most remarkable in his compositions

in the study of Hogarth to follow some-  
guide. There are many things in his  
prints that will easily escape observa-  
tion unless one is permeated somewhat  
with the Hogarthian spirit.

Hogarthians are always enthusiasts,  
and their writing is always delectable  
reading. Hazlitt and Lamb were our  
first great Hogarthians. "Who is your  
favorite author?" some one once asked  
of Lamb. "Why, Shakespeare, of  
course," was the reply. "Yes! yes!  
But who next?" he was asked. "Oh,  
Hogarth," The reply is significant, in-  
asmuch as, by it, it is apparent that  
what Lamb had in mind was the dra-  
matic and ethical value of Hogarth's  
work, rather than its pictorial aspect.  
Thackeray also was an Hogarthian en-

thusiast, as may be seen in his "Eng-  
lish Humorists," where he gives Hog-  
arth a place along with Swift, Addi-  
son, Steele, Fielding and Sterne. But,  
like Lamb, that which Thackeray finds  
most valuable in Hogarth is the ethi-  
cal effectiveness of his work. Later  
Hogarthians do more justice to Hog-  
arth. They take into account not only  
his ethical effectiveness, his drama-  
tic intensity, his knowledge of the  
world and of human nature, his humor,  
but also his merits as an artist. Of  
these later Hogarthian writers prin-  
cipal honor must be given to the late G.  
A. Sala and to Mr. Austin Dobson.  
Sala's "William Hogarth, Painter, En-  
graver and Philosopher," first pub-  
lished in "Cornhill" in 1869, when Thack-  
eray was editor, is perhaps the most

enthusiastic and the most generally in-  
structive of all modern writing on Hog-  
arth. But a better work for the or-  
dinary reader or student, inasmuch as  
it is simpler and more logical in its  
arrangement, is Dobson's "Hogarth" in  
the "Illustrated Biographies of the  
Great Artists" series (New York: Scrib-  
ner's). Mr. Dobson's work, he himself  
says, is the result of "many years' pa-  
tient admiration of this great artist's  
genius." Mr. Sala's work is also, as  
he himself says, "the result of long  
years of study of Hogarth and his  
time."

Hogarth's principal works were sev-  
eral series of plates. The most noted  
of these were (1) "A Harlot's Progress,"  
in six plates (1733-4); (2) "A Rake's  
Progress," in eight plates (1735); and  
(3) "Marriage à la Mode," in six plates  
(1745). These works were produced  
when the artist was in the fullness of  
his power as an observer and satirist  
—that is to say, between his 35th and  
50th years.

Other principal works of Hogarth's,  
published in serial form, were: "Four  
Times of the Day," in four plates  
(1738); "The Effects of Idleness and  
Industry, Exemplified in the Conduct  
of Two Fellow-Prentices" (1747), and  
"Four Prints of an Election" (1755).

But some of Hogarth's single plates  
were quite as famous as any of his  
serial works. The most noted of these  
are: "A Midnight Modern Conversa-  
tion," "The Distressed Poet," "The En-  
raged Musician," "Southwark Fair,"  
"Calais Gate," "The March to Finch-  
ley" and the "Portrait of Simon, Lord  
Lovat."

It was of set purpose that Hogarth  
devoted his genius to plate-making rather  
than to painting. As already stated,  
the picture dealer and other art con-  
noisseurs of his time were against  
him, and it was useless for him to ex-  
pect a remunerative patronage for his  
work as a painter. "They abuse me,"  
he said, "because they think that I am  
opposed to Titian, etc., but it is not Ti-  
tians that I am opposed to, it is the  
third-rate imitators and copiers of Ti-  
tians which they foist upon our picture  
purchasers. However, I let them think  
as they will." But in his skill in en-  
graving Hogarth had a means of get-  
ting a return for his work before the  
public without the intervention of the  
dealers. "By small sums from many,"  
he said, "by the sale of prints which  
I can engrave from my own pictures, I  
can secure my property to myself." His  
method then was to paint his origi-  
nals with the utmost care as finished  
pictures; then to engrave them and to  
sell engravings to the public generally.  
He then had a double means of get-  
ting a return for his work. First the  
plates, and second, the original paint-  
ings. The plates sold well. But it was  
not the ordinary art-patronizing public  
that purchased them. It was as a rule,  
that greater public with whom the pur-  
chase of expensive oil paintings would  
have been impossible. Hogarth thus  
enjoyed a popularity which no other  
painter of his age did. In fact, he was  
a prosperous man. He lived well. He  
kept a good house. He had a good ta-  
ble. He hospitably entertained his  
friends. He had his carriage. But he  
never was able to obtain an adequate  
patronage for his work as a painter.  
His paintings sold at prices insignifi-  
cant compared with those which other  
painters obtained for their work, or as  
compared with those which have been  
realized for them when they were sold  
since his death.

Hogarth's private life was irreproach-  
able. When he was a student under  
Sir James Thornhill, he became ac-  
quainted with Jane Thornhill, Sir  
James' only daughter. Acquaintance  
became friendship. Friendship ripened  
into intimacy, intimacy into love. A  
match was proposed, but Sir James  
was wholly opposed to it. His daugh-  
ter was exceedingly handsome and to  
some extent an heiress, and from the  
family connection and social position of  
her father could look to a match of  
much greater pretensions. Hogarth at  
that time was only an engraver. He  
had not yet given promise of being an  
artist. Lady Thornhill, however, favored  
the young people's desire, and the re-  
sult was a runaway marriage—taking  
place in 1729, when Hogarth was in his  
32d year. The marriage was in every  
way a felicitous one. Sir James soon  
discovered his son-in-law's genius, and  
the two men became the best of friends.  
Mrs. Hogarth made an excellent wife,  
and after her husband's death—which  
occurred somewhat suddenly in 1764,  
in his 67th year—she cherished his  
memory and treasured his name and  
fame with devoted constancy during  
twenty-five years of widowhood.

Hogarth was a typical Englishman,  
and that is one reason why his name is  
now so heartily beloved by his country-  
men. He had his opinions and his pre-  
judices, and he stuck to them tena-  
ciously, no matter at what cost. But  
he was independent, self-reliant, frank,  
 outspoken, thoroughly honest, a hater  
of sham and a lover of his country.  
As he grew older his satire became  
more playful and his exuberant fancy  
more humorous. There were, it is true,  
some sad passages in his later life, that  
had been more discreet and less im-  
pulsive, he might have avoided. But  
on the whole, his last years were full  
of honor and regard, and when he died  
such men as Garrick and Johnson  
came forward, after the good fashion  
of the time, to offer tributes of respect  
to his memory in formal epitaphs.  
Four lines of Garrick's epitaph were  
as follows:

"Farewell, great painter of mankind,  
Who reach'd the noblest point of art,  
Whose pictur'd morals charm the mind  
And through the eye correct the heart."

**A Perfect  
Infant Food**

**Gail Borden  
Eagle Brand  
Condensed Milk**

A PERFECT SUBSTITUTE FOR  
MOTHERS MILK, FOR 40  
YEARS THE LEADING BRAND.

"INFANT HEALTH" SENT FREE.  
N.Y. CONDENSED MILK CO., NEW YORK.